

**PATTERSON &  
SHERIDAN, LLP**

— ATTORNEYS AT LAW —

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 11 2006

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056-6582  
TEL 713.623.4844  
FAX 713.623.4846

## **FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

**DATE:** September 11, 2006  
**FILE NO.:** ROC920000304US1 (IBM2K0304)  
**TO:** MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS  
Examiner Fadok, Mark A.  
**FAX NO.:** 1-571-273-8300  
**FROM:** Gero G. McClellan / David Magness  
**PAGE(S) with cover:** 5

**RE:**

**TITLE:** Process for Data Driven Application Integration for B2B  
**U.S. SERIAL NO.:** 09/837,041  
**FILING DATE:** April 18, 2001  
**INVENTOR(S):** O'Brien et al.  
**EXAMINER:** Fadok, Mark A.  
**GROUP ART UNIT:** 3625  
**CONFIRMATION NO.:** 9205

Attached for the above-referenced application please find:

**1. REPLY BRIEF**

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE**

The document accompanying this facsimile transmission contains information from the law firm of Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P. which is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

PATENT  
 Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000304US1  
 PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0304

RECEIVED  
 CENTRAL FAX CENTER

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

SEP 11 2006

In re Application of:  
 O'Brien et al.

Serial No.: 09/837,041

Confirmation No.: 9205

Filed: April 18, 2001

For: Process for Data Driven  
 Application Integration for B2B

Group Art Unit: 3625

Examiner: Fadok, Mark A.

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS  
 Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to fax number 571-273-8300 to the attention of Examiner Fadok, Mark A., on the date shown below:

September 11, 2006  
 Date

Joseph Jong

## REPLY BRIEF

Applicants submit this *Reply Brief* to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in response to the *Examiner's Answer* dated July 11, 2006 (hereinafter *Examiner's Answer*). While Applicants' maintain each of the arguments submitted in Applicants' previously submitted *Appeal Brief*, Applicants make the following further arguments in light of the *Examiner's Answer*. Please charge any additional fees that may be required to make this Reply Brief timely and acceptable to Deposit Account No. 09-0465/ROC920000304US1.

500068\_1

Page 1

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000304US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0304

## ARGUMENT

### I. THE EXAMINER ERRED IN REJECTING CLAIMS 1-4, AND 8-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY *MELTZER*

#### *The Current Rejection*

Claims 1-4, and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Meltzer et al.* (6,125,391).

#### *The Examiner's Definitions*

On Page 4, Part 12 of the *Examiner's Answer*, the Examiner provides a list of definitions with which the Examiner construes the claims. Regarding the definitions provided by the Examiner, Applicants submit that, for purposes of prosecution, the claims should be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Further, irrespective of which of the Examiner's definitions is applied, Applicants submit that the claims are patentable as discussed in Applicants' *Appeal Brief* and for the reasons discussed herein.

#### *The Examiner's Arguments*

On pages 5-6 of the *Examiner's Answer*, the Examiner provides additional clarification with respect to the Examiner's previously submitted arguments. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that the previous rejection of the claims is maintained and further directs Applicants to Figure 13 of *Meltzer*. The Examiner states that Figure 13 of *Meltzer* depicts "at least one application present and transforming the format from a requesting entity and mapping the data into a transformed document" at steps 1300-1303. The Examiner further states that there must be metadata produced to define what the relationship is since the data needs to be transformed back to the original format when sent to the requestor, citing step 1311. The Examiner also states that the router service described in *Meltzer* calls the program that is needed to process

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000304US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0304

the service requested by the participant, citing *Meltzer* at Figure 13, steps 1304 and 1310 and Col. 83, Lines 1-30.

*Applicants Response to the Examiner's Arguments*

With respect to the Examiner's clarifications, Applicants respectfully maintain that the Examiner has still failed to indicate where *Meltzer* describes the claimed subject matter. For example, Applicants' claims (see, e.g., Claim 1) are directed to "a specification document configured to produce metadata defining a relationship between data of the request in the original format and data of the request in the transformed format, wherein the metadata comprises a plurality of metadata instances each configured to support a different request protocol".

With respect to the cited figure, the Examiner has not indicated where *Meltzer* describes a specification document configured to produce metadata defining a relationship between data of the request in the original format and data of the request in the transformed format. In describing Figure 13, *Meltzer* merely indicates that a parsed document is translated into the format of the host, for example, from XML to JAVA. Figure 13, Item 1303, Col. 83, Lines 51-52. In describing translation, *Meltzer* indicates "the apparatus for establishing participant interfaces ... includes programs of instructions ... to compile instructions executable by the system to translate the input document to the corresponding data structures." Col. 5, Lines 40-56.

Thus, translation in *Meltzer* is performed by *instructions of a program*. *Meltzer* does not describe "metadata defining a relationship between data of the request in the original format and data of the request in the transformed format". With respect to the Examiner's statement on Page 6 regarding *Meltzer* that "there must be metadata produced to define what the relationship is", the Examiner has neither provided a citation to *Meltzer* indicating where such metadata is shown nor has the Examiner met the burden required to show that such teaching is inherent in *Meltzer*. See MPEP Sec. 2112. Indeed, *Meltzer* specifically teaches that the translation is performed solely by compiled instructions without the benefit of metadata produced from a specification document. Col. 5, Lines 40-56. Finally, Applicants note that *Meltzer* merely refers to a single type of translation from XML to JAVA. Figure 13, Item 1303. Thus, *Meltzer*

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000304US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0304

teaches that incoming documents use a single XML format. The Examiner has failed to indicate where *Meltzer* describes metadata that comprises a plurality of metadata instances each configured to support a *different request protocol*. For these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Finally, with respect to the Examiner's arguments on page 6 of the *Examiner's Answer* that *Meltzer* describes a router service which calls a program, Applicants respectfully reiterate the distinction between "routing" and "calling" described on page 13, paragraph 2 of Applicants' *Appeal Brief*. In light of this distinction, *Meltzer* does not teach "a flow manager configured to utilize the metadata to map the request in the original format to the request in the transformed format *and to call the at least one application*". Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, the cited reference does not teach, show or suggest all of the limitations of the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/  
Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Appellant(s)